Application to Become a Consultant to the Center for Scientific Anomalies Research
(Please print or type responses.)

Name of applicant: J. Richard Greenwell Date of application March 16, 1982

Degrees and/or relevant training B.A. Anthropology & Psychology (double major)

Professional affiliation or position Arid Lands Committee, University of Arizona

Publications relevant to scientific anomalies research: Numerous articles published in Science, Bioscience, Zetetic Scholar, The Skeptical Inquirer, Frontiers of Science, Science Digest, OMNI, Info Journal, The MUFON journal (list available on request) Current Anthropology, Northwest Anthropological Research Notes.

Membership(s) in other organizations relevant to anomalies research: International Fortean Organization, International Society of Cryptozoology (Secretary).

Your special area(s) of anomaly concern (e.g., parapsychology, UFOs, etc.):

Cryptozoology; UFO phenomena; Parapsychology.

Character of your anomaly work (e.g., experimental, academic, etc.):

Literature reviews (all subjects); field work (cryptozoology); surveys (cryptozoology and Parapsychology).

What do you hope to gain from being a consultant to CSAR? Communicate with persons of similar interests and exchange publications/information.

Name and address as you wish them listed in the CSAR CONSULTANTS DIRECTORY:

J. Richard Greenwell, 1220 E. Copper St., Tucson, AZ 85719.

Telephone(s): (602) 884-8369 home; (602) 626-4013 office

This application is to become a [Research Consultant X
Resource Consultant ____] (please check one)

We would like to know as much about your expertise as possible. Please attach any vitae or bibliography on your work available. Off-prints of your work for the CSAR files would be most welcome. Please use the back of this form to add any information you wish to convey to us.

Will submit a list of publications when updated.

Please give us two references for persons familiar with your work re anomalies and who are likely known to us: Dr. Ron Westrum, Eastern Michigan University

Dr. Paul McCarthy, Honolulu, Hawaii

Return this to: CSAR; Box 1052; Ann Arbor, MI 48103

THANKS

Marcello: This
article just came out!
They are beginning to
work on the Fall, 1981
issue...

ISSN 0029-3296

NORTHWEST ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH NOTES

The Rock Art of Western Washington ..... Daniel Leen 1

On the Taxonomic Status of Sasquatch: An Anthropological Consensus ..... J. Richard Greenwell and James E. King 57

Abstracts of Papers Presented at the 33rd Annual Northwest Anthropological Conference 60

The Ethnobotanical Imperative: A Consideration of Obligations, Implications, and Methodology ..... Helen H. Norton and Steven J. Gill 117

SPRING 1981 VOL. 15, No. 1

REPRINTED FROM

NORTHWEST ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH NOTES

Vol. 15, No. 1, Spring 1981

ON THE TAXONOMIC STATUS OF SASQUATCH: AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONSENSUS

J. RICHARD GREENWELL
JAMES E. KING
University of Arizona

ABSTRACT

Three hundred Ph.D.-level scientists were surveyed on their views concerning the supposed sasquatch of North America and the animals supposedly inhabiting Loch Ness, Scotland. Of the 50 sasquatch questionnaires mailed to American and Canadian physical anthropologists, 39 were returned, and 30 respondents offered comments on the possible taxonomic status of sasquatch. Of those willing to offer a specific taxonomic assessment (16 individuals), 80% favored *Gigantopithecus* as the most likely candidate.

A debate has raged for many years concerning the existence of a large, unknown primate in North America, popularly known as bigfoot or sasquatch. A "sub-debate," mainly among the knowledgable on the subject, has concerned the taxonomic status of this supposed primate. We report here the consensus of opinion among physical anthropologists on this question.

Our information is derived from the results of a 1978 survey of 300 professional scientists. The survey solicited specific views on the existence of the supposed sasquatch, and the large animals supposedly inhabiting Loch Ness, Scotland. One of the questions in our questionnaires concerned the possible taxonomic status of these legendary creatures. Additional survey results, including a selection of informative and abusive comments by the respondents, may be found elsewhere (Greenwell and King 1980), and a detailed presentation of the results will be published at some future time (King and Greenwell in preparation).

The 300 Ph.D.-level scientists surveyed were 100 physical anthropolgists, 100 biological limnologists and oceanographers, and 100 physical chemists. Half of each group (50 individuals) received a Bigfoot questionnaire; the other half received a Loch Ness questionnaire. A total of 178 usable questionnaires were returned, of which 94 were on sasquatch; 39 of these were returned by physical anthropologists, 32 by biological limnologists/oceanographers, and 23 by physical chemists.

Thirty (76.9%) of the 39 physical anthropologists responding on Bigfoot offered comments concerning its possible taxonomic status, whereas only 13 (40.6%) of the responding biological limnologist/oceanographers, and a mere 3 (13%) of the responding physical chemists did so. It should be noted that

the question was posed in terms of what species or branch of primate evolution would the respondent expect sasquatch to represent if one were indeed found, regardless of the respondent's opinion about its actual existence.

The three opinions by physical chemists were human or great ape, *Homo sapiens*, and apes. The 13 opinions by biological limnologist/oceanographers were as follows: upper primate, something akin to *Homo habilis*, a hominid (possibly genus *Homo*), illegible, genus *Homo*, *Homo*, *Homo erectus*, apes, probably different genus from *Homo*, *Australopithecus robustus*, multiple branches are possible, pongid, and *Homo sapiens*.

The 50 physical anthropologists surveyed on bigfoot were selected for their expressed specialization in human and primate evolution, and it is their responses, consequently, which are of particular interest.

As indicated above, 30 of the 39 responding physical anthropologists commented on sasquatch's possible taxonomic status; of these, 14 offered comments of a non-specific nature, as follows: there never has been a hominid that size, anthropoid-hominoid, *not Homo erectus* - something unknown, possibly more than one species, a prosimian or New World monkey, ape or monkey, could not be catarrhine, early hominid near hominoid divergence, maybe not even a primate, pongid of some sort, illegible, unknown species, New World prosimian, and *Homo sapiens*. Sixteen physical anthropologists, however, responded more specifically, as follows: *Gigantopithecus*, 12 (80%); *Homo erectus*, 2; *Paranthropus*, 1; and *Dryopithecus*, 1.

It is striking that not one of the respondents mentioned Neanderthal man, the prime candidate of some Russian specialists (Porshnev 1974; Bayanov and Bourtsev 1976). Perhaps this should not be too surprising, however, as modern American anthropology incorporates Neanderthal into the human species (*Homo sapiens neanderthalensis*), and sasquatch, for all his other reported peculiarities, is never reported in association with fire, tools, permanent shelter, or clothing; all of which are attributed to Neanderthal. The Russians, incidentally, do not even accept Neanderthal as *Homo*, and believe that, while he did possess the above technology at one time, he was "regressed" back to his present state--bigfoot--by the rapid progression of man.

Paranthropus is also poorly represented in the responses, and his northern brother *Australopithecus robustus* is not even mentioned (except by a limnologist/oceanographer). It is clear that *Gigantopithecus* is by far the favorite candidate among American and Canadian physical anthropologists who are willing to offer a specific taxonomic assessment on sasquatch; 80% mentioned *Gigantopithecus*.

Sasquatch's reported massive size (500-700 lbs.) and his lack of technology, corresponds to similar putative characteristics of *Gigantopithecus*. There is, however, some question about *Gigantopithecus*' large size, since only jaw and teeth fossils have been recovered, and, while these are indeed massive, the correlation between tooth size and body size

is not a significant one (Garn and Lewis 1958). Nevertheless, it seems to be commonly assumed that sasquatch, if he exists at all, either evolved from *Gigantopithecus* into a more massive pongid, or that witnessess' descriptions are exaggerated, or both.

No irrefutable physical evidence exists to support the existence of sasquatch (although there is a surprisingly large amount of indirect evidence, including footprint casts and hair and fecal samples), and our survey question on taxonomic status was, in a sense, an unfair one. One anthropologist, who clearly did not accept Bigfoot, responded thus: "if frogs had fur, what color would it be?"

We do not regret, however, including the question. The general answer seems to be: "If sasquatch were real, he would be *Gigantopithecus*."

References Cited

Bayanov, Dmitri and Igor Bourtsev
1976 On Neanderthal vs. *Paranthropus*. *Current Anthropology*, 17(2):312-218.

Garn, Stanley M. and Arthur B. Lewis
1958 Tooth Size, Body-Size and "Giant" Fossil Man. *American Anthropologist*, 60(5):874-880.

Greenwell, J. Richard and J. E. King
1980 Scientists and Anomalous Phenomena: Preliminary Results of a Survey. *Zetetic Scholar*, No. 6 (Department of Sociology, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti).

Porshnev, B. F.
1974 The Troglodytidae and the Hominidae in the Taxonomy and Evolution of Higher Primates. *Current Anthropology*, 15(4):449-456.